

**COASTAL NONPOINT POLLUTION CONTROL
PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION MEETING**

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

**RICHMOND, VIRGINIA
APRIL 28TH – MAY 1, 2003**

Submitted by
Judy Burtner of
J. Burtner & Associates
Richmond, Virginia

Table of Contents

<u>Executive Summary</u>	1
<u>Meeting Process</u>	3
<u>Issue Identification Work Groups</u>	5
<u>Implementation</u>	5
<u>Evaluation and Reporting</u>	15
<u>Coordination</u>	18
<u>Tracking and Monitoring</u>	21
<u>Additional Comments on Index Cards</u>	24
<u>Setting Priorities Among Issue Groupings</u>	26
<u>Issue Resolution Work Groups</u>	28
<u>Defining Implementation</u>	28
<u>Integration of Reporting Processes</u>	29
<u>Minimum Standards/Criteria</u>	29
<u>State Coordination and Integration</u>	30
<u>Federal Coordination</u>	31
<u>Purpose of Tracking and Monitoring</u>	33
<u>Flexibility and Targeting</u>	33
<u>Water Quality vs. Management Measures</u>	34
<u>Closing Discussion</u>	37
<u>Overall Meeting Comments</u>	39

Executive Summary

In an ongoing effort to work with states and territories to develop and implement Coastal Nonpoint programs, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provided funding for a national meeting held in Richmond, Virginia April 28th – May 1st, 2003. Seventy-one individuals representing Coastal Nonpoint programs in thirty-one states and territories, the Coastal States Organization, EPA (headquarters and regional), and NOAA participated. Many state participants are new to the program.

Joseph H. Maroon, Director, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, and the Honorable Tayloe P. Murphy, Secretary of Natural Resources, welcomed participants to the Commonwealth of Virginia and the workshop. John Kuriawa (NOAA) gave a CZARA/6217 overview that included the current national status relative to program approvals and implementation. He asked participants to move past the impediments to solutions. Mark Slauter, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation and Ms. Judy Burtner of J. Burtner & Associates provided an overview of the meeting process and logistics.

The primary goal of the meeting was for federal and state partners jointly develop specific recommendations for Coastal Nonpoint Program implementation and administration for consideration by all state managers and federal staff. This was further defined through two objectives;

1. Identify and prioritize the impediments (issues) to moving forward with implementation of the Coastal Nonpoint Program (CNP)
2. Identify possible solutions for the identified issues

The goal and objectives were based on a work group process that was utilized to develop four white papers. The white papers reviewed existing statutes and guidance to identify a set of primary issues and provide discussion items for addressing the issues. Thirty-two people from 17 states, EPA, and NOAA participated in the work group process.

This report presents all of the discussions and comments generated during the meeting in its raw form. One section of particular note is the “Setting Priorities Among Issue Groupings” on page 22. While this represents the priorities identified by the group, there was insufficient time to discuss each priority. Many of these require follow-up actions.

Key aspects of the meeting include:

- A list of priorities was identified and work groups developed actions items or next steps to address the priorities.
- Time did not permit group discussion on the information developed as an action item or next step.
- Participants did not have the opportunity to indicate whether they were in agreement with what had been proposed by the work groups. While there is

support for all of the identified priorities, there is no ‘universal’ agreement among participants.

- Work would continue on parallel paths. Where possible, white papers would be revised to accommodate new information created during the workshop. The papers should be viewed as living documents.
- At the same time, NOAA and EPA will review the results, and with one voice, provide feedback to workshop participants on things that are “doable.” Where possible, questions would be answered and guidance provided.
- In addition, to the white paper work groups, additional work groups may be formed to continue the work of the workshop or work groups may be formed as subsets of the white paper work groups.
- Each work group, regardless of placement, will have NOAA, EPA, and state representation on it. NOAA and EPA will form these groups as soon as possible.
- NOAA will gather success stories of how states have spent their 6217 funds and place the information on the website. NOAA and EPA will work together to provide a clearinghouse for success stories.
- It was also stated that participants wanted to acknowledge that the need for funding was important but the criteria that was used in setting priorities precluded it from being ranked higher (as an area to be worked on during the remainder of the session).

Additional comments were generated during the meeting wrap-up session and are provided at the end of this report. Also provided are discussion points generated during the issue identification session that were not addressed during the reporting out portion and comments provided about the meeting process itself.

Meeting Process

Four white papers were developed in preparation for the workshop. They focused on the areas of implementation, evaluation and reporting, coordination, and tracking and monitoring. They were distributed to participants prior to their arrival in Richmond. Each paper included an overview of the area, identified key issues, and in some cases, made recommendations, and in others, raised questions to be addressed.

During the workshop, a representative of each work group that developed a paper gave an overview of the paper. Following the tracking and monitoring overview, a brief presentation was made by Mr. Barry Evans of a tracking and monitoring model that was developed at Penn State.

Following the implementation paper overview, participants were asked to silently reflect on the issues in the paper and possibly those not in the paper that they thought if resolved would move implementation forward, and write them on an index card. They were then asked to share what they had written on their cards with others in their table group and collectively agree on the issues that if addressed would move implementation forward, and record them on a flipchart. These items were reported out and an unduplicated list created for review by participants.

Participants then working in their table groups chose the five issues they thought were most important that if addressed would move implementation forward significantly. These items were collected from each table group and sorted into like groupings.

A similar process was followed with the evaluation and reporting, coordination, and tracking and monitoring papers with one change. Issues were identified in the implementation section that related to evaluation and reporting, coordination, and tracking and monitoring so it was agreed that each table group would identify the five issues that if addressed would move each of the following areas of evaluation and reporting, coordination, and tracking and monitoring forward. They were given the option of identifying issues they thought were critical that would not identified in the appropriate white paper. Few new issues were identified.

Each time there was a change to a different white paper, the composition of table groups changed.

Once the work around identification of issues around the white papers was completed, participants set priorities among the items in each of the four white paper areas. Written brainstorming was done on the top items after which participants self-selected the area around which they would like to work in developing solutions to address the issue.

Each work group reported out their work. Participants were given the opportunity to add ideas to the reports as a means of strengthening the solutions.

It was agreed that the white papers would incorporate the work into the papers as they are revised. In addition, Dov Weitman as a representative of EPA would work with John Kuriawa from NOAA to get a response back to participants on the workshop's work and answer questions where it was possible to answer them. Also, they would move forward (not waiting for the rewrites of the white papers) on the formation of additional work groups if needed to implement the plans/solutions that had been suggested. Each work group is to include representatives from EPA, NOAA, and the states.

The workshop concluded with Mark Slauter asking participants to either share what each thought were next steps. Some chose to share what was uppermost on their minds.

What follows in this report is a summary listing of all the work conducted in small groups, the prioritization of ideas, the written brainstorming, the work group reports, and the ideas that were contributed by participants at the end of the workshop. The information has been taken directly from the written reports. No changes have been made other than to correct spelling and grammar where appropriate.

Issue Identification Work Groups

*** Implementation***

The twelve table group reports (the issues both in the paper and those not captured in the paper they thought should be addressed in order to move implementation forward)

Table #1

- States focused on meeting conditions (not implementation)
- Limited staff/commitment/resources (state and federal) to nonpoint programs (6217)
- Relying on other authorities through network makes implementation difficult
- Need to define implementation for states
- What is the role of 6217 with other programs?
- Limited visibility
- Unclear overall goal of program/message
- Nonpoint statewide issue – why focus on coast?
- Lack of program/issue recognition and awareness
- Guidance/BMPs for islands
- Revisit 5/15-year plans
- Timeframes insufficient
- Strength of the program is the technology-based approach and that message is lost
- Failure to target program (specifically geographically, targeting impaired water bodies – should be program niche)
- Need more stakeholder involvement

Table #2

- 5/15-year plans – clarification
- National program integration/coordination (6217, 319, TMDLs, NPDES, USDA)
- Emphasis on state flexibility and prioritization/state needs come first
- What has the program accomplished? What has been implemented? (New laws, BMP documents, state/local coordination,)
- Improved state integration/coordination (define 6217 “niches,” determine focus)
- Sustainable and larger funding sources needed

Table #3

- For some states – networked but not connected; programs in different agencies reporting for different federal agencies
- Roles/persons – who implements and who is responsible to monitor/track
- Timelines not realistic
- Plans not sequenced: clarify, consolidate reporting needs – what to report when – NOAA/EPA need to coordinate first (319, annual and management plans, 5/15-year plans)

- Not in full agreement on definition: programmatic and BMPs
- States need to be in charge of their own destiny; can't do everything all the time, everywhere; target for greatest impact
- Incorporating programs – what should be incorporated into coastal and what should go into 319? How do we do this? What's the progress?

Table #4

- Awareness/knowledge
- Funding/resources to leverage
- Nonpoint program coordination (state and state, state and federal) (CZM-CZARA/319/state dollars/other federal programs)
- Stature in state organizational structure
- Lack of clout
- Program review and response time – timelines
- Define implementation: implementing management measures – on the ground, monitoring, tracking, realistic expectations, program/policy
- Funds for prevention versus correcting impaired waters
- Cultural diversity – personal stewardship
- Increase in conventional wisdom

Table #5

- Coordination/cooperation
- Funding resources to leverage
- Program awareness
- Diagram: Awareness needed to attract resources, support coordination/cooperation. Funds to support increased awareness

Table #6

- How to adjust implementation schedules to take advantage of opportunities?
- How do we take advantage of existing funding – e.g., 319, Farm Bill, SRF?
- Institutionalization of state CZARA programs
- How to “inject” management measures into TMDLs, watershed plans, 319, Phase II, Farm Bill?
- What does “implementation of management measures” mean and how do we know when full implementation has been achieved – e.g., thresholds, programmatic versus on-the-ground?
- How to use 5/15-year planning process to help leverage other programs and agencies?

Table #7

- Accountability for implementation amongst diverse agencies (Guam and GA) – problems with interagency collaboration, conflicts with funding sources

- Match requirements for grant dollars are prohibitive (to local governments)
- Inconsistent 6217 budgets from year to year – disincentive
- Better program marketing to players so they can budget for it (incorporate it into work plans)
- Disparity between states regarding where they are in approval process – impediment. Need to incorporate in more flexibility
- NOAA trying simultaneously to approve conditional states and assure implementation in approved states – Need easier approval so can focus on implementation
- Working on lifting conditions means less efforts for implementation
- Establishing MOA/binding agreements with related agencies
- Spending time on getting full approval takes away from focus on real issues
- Delay in approval – Bonus funds not available
- Inconsistency
- Disconnect between EPA regions/EPQ headquarters/NOAA
- Clear guidance in writing to obtain program approval

Table #8

- Need clear and timely written responses from NOAA-EPA on materials submitted by the states
- Who is CNP “lead?” What does it mean? Responsibility of lead? Different leads for different issues?
- Funding – different programs have different restrictions, parameters. This hinders implementation.
- (Interpretation of diagram) 6217 represents the umbrella that has under it: CZM, 319, Farm Bill, TMDL, Storm water. Holding the handle of the umbrella is the CNP coordinator (Jack G.)
- Targeting – how to use? Based on priority issues/waters – 303 (D)? TMDL? NEP? Critical coastal areas?
- Look at administrative charges
- Clarification – should every state target and look coast wide?
- What is the ultimate goal?
- Building constituency/local involvement
- Tie to specific local issues – habitat protection; riparian erosion; flood plains – think of how to sell to locals
- “Downstream problem”
- Must be adaptable
- Coordinate existing implementation processes?
- Different level of detail needed for different categories?
- “Lead” can decide which measures to focus on for implementation, tracking, etc.
- Inter-agency group – divide up tracking, reporting

Table #9

- What is the goal?

- Need to define
- Need to prioritize (phase-in implementation)
- \$\$\$
 - Realistic expectations based on funds
 - Type of implementation – coordination versus on-the-ground?
- Awareness/coordination
 - NOAA/EPA to other federal agencies
 - Interstate coordination to leverage funds and projects
 - Then can market; share success stories to get more support or funds from Congress or others
- Federal agencies
 - Better EPA/NOAA coordination
 - EPA headquarters buy-in? Do they support the program?
 - States need to communicate their “needs” to EPA/NOAA

Table #10

- Definition of “implementation”
- Adequate resources – funding, staff, agency support, need for state match
- Establish start time and role of 5-year plans and 15-year strategy – clarify role/purpose
- Process for evaluating implementation progress – flexibility + consistency
- Achievable expectations? – Size of program (boundary manageable)?
- Effective coordination and partner participation (federal)
- Program visibility
- Working within the existing regulatory framework – overcoming resistance

Table #11

- When does the implementation clock start for 5/15-year plans? (Conditional approval at 15 years from full implementation. When do we have to have full approval?)
- OSDs full implementation versus priority or partial implementation – also applies to others
- Need to target funding for tasks
- Need consistent funding – adequate and stable – influence Congress
- Clear expectations from NOAA and EPA – evaluation, tracking, monitoring, reporting

- What does automatic incorporation mean? How do you do it? Incorporation of enforceable policies into CZM?
- Coordination with other NPS programs
- Lack of identity – state and national
- Sanctions are counterproductive
- United political backing – need support for significant issues – lack of identity
- Lack of reporting format – coordination with 319 reporting
- How to tie reporting with water quality results – need to target implementation to focus on priorities – how do you measure if you are making a difference?
- Can we prioritize management measures by impact for watersheds?
- How do you allow for structural differences in states’ governments in meeting timelines?
- Do states have leeway to target priorities?
- Clarify use of 319 funds – phase II NPDES and coastal funds (coordination)
- Need a clear roadmap for implementation (internal)
- What is local government’s responsibility (internal)?
- Need marketing/communications and outreach program – need for training and assistance
- Need full approval

Table #12

- Perception – public and agency (education) – visibility
- Need state-defined implementation
 - State defined goals
 - Duplication (perceived or otherwise)
 - Small 6217 impact (real world) versus expectations
 - Credibility
 - Geographic extent versus smaller CZM boundaries, larger than 319 boundaries
- 5/15-year plans/strategies – should focus on “gaps” that other programs don’t address
 - Phase II – can 6217 help to address real needs?
- Need for stable funding
- Perception (2) – duplication

The above table reports were collapsed (duplications removed) into forty-four items. The forty-four items are as follows:

1. Disconnect between EPA regions, EPA headquarters, and NOAA regarding what is sufficient for approval

2. State-defined implementation? Should be state-defined within the broad parameters of the federal statute, i.e., each state should be allowed to define what implementation is
3. There is a need for clarification relative to 5/15-year plans. Establish a start time and clarify role and purpose – who, what when, why, etc. They may focus more on the gaps (where things are not getting done).
4. How to “inject” management measures into existing programs, i.e., TMDLs, watershed plans, phase II, Farm Bill, 319?
5. Coordination and cooperation among state partners
6. Roles and responsibilities – who implements and who is responsible for monitoring and tracking?
7. Implementation and conditional approval – hard to focus on both
8. Funding – different programs have different restrictions on funding hindering implementation
9. What are the goals of the implementation program? What is the national program goal?
10. Limited staff/commitment and resources to NPS programs at the state and federal levels – particularly 6217
11. Can we prioritize management measures by impact for watersheds? How do we allow for structural differences in state governments in meeting timelines?
12. Delay in approvals has made bonus implementation funds unavailable for unapproved states
13. Demonstrate at the federal and state levels what has been accomplished and what has been implemented
14. How do we know when full implementation has been achieved – i.e., Thresholds, programmatic versus on-the-ground BMPs?
15. Lack of resources to leverage for implementation of the program
16. Incorporation programs – what should be incorporated, what to 319, what to CZM, what is the process?
17. Tying implementation to local issues for buy-in and commitment
18. Realistic expectations based on the amount of funds to use in implementation
19. Definition of “implementation” – define the usage
20. Limited program visibility and program recognition and awareness
21. Perception of program duplication with respect to other programs
22. Clear expectations from NOAA and EPA for evaluation, tracking, monitoring and reporting needed
23. Clear and timely written responses jointly sent out to NOAA, EPA headquarters, and EPA regions on written material submitted to them by states
24. How to use 5/15 year-plans and take advantage of existing funding to leverage other programs in other agencies
25. Clarification on struggle between restoration and prevention
26. What needs to be reported when? Clarification and sequencing of reports for 319, CZM, etc.
27. How to coordinate implementation of existing programs?
28. Federal support of the program and incorporation into other federal programs specifically within EPA

29. Working within the regulatory framework, i.e., overcoming resistance to regulations and not assuming more authority
30. Lack of authority to require certain implementation plans (having to rely on other state agencies to network and coordinate)
31. How to ensure your implementation plan addresses gaps?
32. When do agencies have to have full implementation? 5/15-years from conditional or full approval?
33. Need for NOAA and EPA to go back to the administrative changes and look over the states' programs and see what states measure
34. NOAA and EPA need to revisit state coastal nonpoint submittals in light of the flexibility of the 1998 administrative changes to determine which remaining conditionally approved measures can be fully approved before states develop their 5/15-year implementation plans
35. 6217 is trying to be an "umbrella" program – other programs do not want to play! Can this be an umbrella program and gnat-swatting (gap filling) program?
36. States need to communicate their needs to EPA and NOAA
37. States have a problem coming up with the state match to attract federal funds – issue of inadequate funds
38. Perception of program only focusing on coastal waters
39. Lack of adequate and STABLE funding
40. Balance between flexibility and consistency needed when reviewing state programs
41. Lack of specific guidance for BMPs' implementation for islands
42. Effective coordination and partnership between federal agencies
43. Failure to adequately target the program to specifically geographic areas such as impaired waters
44. Failure to take advantage of the strength of the program which is a technology-based approach

Each table group (12 groups) identified no more than five areas that if addressed would move implementation significantly forward. These areas were collected, sorted into like grouping with a title given to its grouping. What follows are the results with the group title appearing first following by the language that appeared on "sticky" notes that were submitted by the table groups.

- Need for coordination/integration
 - Tying implementation to local concerns
 - Define relationship of 6217 to other programs
 - Injecting management measures into other programs
 - How to inject management measures into existing program
 - Coordinate and integrate at state, local, federal levels with existing programs
 - Buy-in/coordination on program implementation at various levels – fed to fed, fed to state, state to local

- How can we effectively work with all affected state and local stakeholders?
 - Clarify what should be formally incorporated into existing CZM program, 319 program (e.g., laws, goals, milestones, BMP targets) – How/when should this be accomplished?
 - How to coordinate implementation of existing programs?
 - Coordination between federal agencies on existing and new programs
 - How can we better integrate 6217 among state water quality programs?
 - Define roles and responsibilities of head CNPs agency – who is responsible for implementing tracking coordination?
 - Integration into other NPS programs – 319, Phase II, TMDLs, etc.
 - Finding a niche for program at state level
 - Improved integration of 6217 with related NPS programs (e.g., TMDLs, 319, Farm Bill, Phase II)
 - Should be one component of comprehensive state/regional water quality management plan?
- Increase Funding – Stable funding base
 - Funding (all)
 - Program goals (+ technology) commensurate with funding
 - Stable and adequate funding/resources
 - Sustainable and larger funding sources needed
 - Funding – how to integrate coastal priorities into existing statewide NPS funding decisions
 - Funding issues – lack of stable, secure funding; restrictions; ability to leverage resources
 - Funding/resources – realistic expectations (amount versus goals), prioritization
 - Funding – different programs have different restrictions on funding hindering implementation
 - Increase support for technology, funding, staff
 - Realistic expectations based on the amount of funds to implement
- Defining implementation
 - Definition of implementation
 - States define implementation
 - Define implementation realistically
 - Define implementation – when achieved, how to incorporate thresholds, targeting and timeframes?
 - States define implementation and needs, and EPA and NOAA must listen – don't second-guess states' knowledge of problems, resources, and limitations
 - State-defined implementation

- How to define implementation and realistic goals. What are our indicators of success? e.g., thresholds, programmatic versus on-the-ground
- Administrative Issues – 5/15-year plans
 - 5/15-year plans clarification (2 groups)
 - Role of 5/15-year plan
 - Timelines – reporting, review/responses
 - Clarification of 5/15-year plan requirements
 - How can we use 5/15-year plans to take advantage of all existing programs, plans (federal, state, local)?
 - What sort of federal feedback is needed when states submit their 5/15-year plans?
 - What sort of official “approval” or “acceptance” of state 5/15-year plans is needed from the feds?
 - Better define 5/15-year plans – what they should include?
 - NOAA/EPA need to revisit program submittals in light of 1998 administrative changes to determine which measures can be fully approved and then states can develop the 5 and 15-year implementation plans
- Need for marketing and more visibility
 - Failure to take advantage of the strength of the program – a technology-based approach
 - More effort to market program and define image
 - Program awareness, marketing – to overcome perceptions
 - Program visibility – tying implementation into local issues for local buy-in
 - Visibility, marketing, outreach
 - Explain what the CNP has accomplished and what has been implemented
 - Program recognition/awareness/visibility
- Need for clarifying expectations
 - Clear expectations from feds for each area of implementation
 - Clarify reporting to help implement program more efficiently
 - Define national goal expectations – must be clear and achievable
 - To facilitate implementation – bring all states to the fully approved phase (find a way to fully approve all states without imposing sanctions)
- Flexibility/consistency in defining implementation – state focus
 - Find a balance between flexibility and consistency to allow states to define implementation (targeting, priorities)
 - Define leeway consistent with national goal and standards versus states’ ability to make changes – where can this happen?

- State needs come first! Emphasis on state flexibility and prioritization
-

Evaluation and Reporting

Participants, working in table groups (12), identified no more than five issues they felt if addressed would move the implementation of evaluation and reporting processes forward. They also were given an opportunity to identify additional issues they thought of importance but that were not included in the paper. The five issues could come from the paper or be ones not included in the paper. Each table's issues were brought forth, sorted into like groupings, and given a group name. The results (group title and information from sticky notes used in the sorting process) were as follows:

- Need for minimum standards/criteria
 - Revisit 5/15-year plan requirements – could this be reformatted to meet reporting requirements?
 - Should use 5/15-year plans to evaluate and report
 - Re-evaluate 5/15-year plans and use them to drive implementation activities
 - What role, if any, will a state's 5/15-year plan play in the evaluation process? (2 groups – exact wording)
 - Need to standardize/coordinate joint region/NOAA/EPA evaluation criteria
 - What criteria will be used by EPA/NOAA to assess progress?
 - What criteria will EPA/NOAA use to assess state progress in implementing the states' CNP programs?
 - Can a tiered system of evaluation be considered? e.g., coordination, implementation, priority and tracking, on-the-ground water quality improvement
 - Need to develop national evaluation criteria without infringing on states' ability to design their own programs
 - Expectations of evaluations should be appropriate to level of funding
 - Develop minimum standards for evaluation that assures level or increased funding
 - Evaluation – what are we using to measure progress? – 5/15-year plan relationship
 - Need for conformity between states for reporting quantitatively
 - Need to have reporting requirements evolve to show quantitative results (i.e., number of BMPs, percentage of coastal zone coverage, to 305(b)-type water quality results)
- Need for integrating the reporting processes
 - Need cooperation and coordination from partners to prepare consolidated report
 - Multiple/duplicative reporting for different purposes – 319, CZM-312

- Fold evaluation and reporting process into existing evaluation progress (319, Farm Bill, 312) 5/15-year plan – identify gaps and add on to existing reporting processes as necessary
 - Evaluation/reporting criteria – how to include other programs’ requirements (e.g., 319, Farm Bill)?
 - Evaluation and reporting needs to be formatted to “stand alone” or be part of 319 and 312 evaluations and reports
 - Is there an existing mechanism that can be used or adapted?
 - Can existing reporting be utilized?
 - Use/adapt existing reporting mechanisms (e.g., put coastal element in annual 319 report like Delaware)
 - Can we use existing reporting mechanisms?
 - How do we link/address 6217 reporting needs based on other existing programs – can we build integration into evaluation process especially with minimal resources and funding?
 - Evaluation and reporting should have utility for 6217 and other programs like 319
- Need to clarify purpose of evaluation and reporting and identify the intended audience
 - How will reports be used?
 - Realistic goals to use as a benchmark for evaluation
 - What is the purpose? States need the flexibility to determine their own best means of reporting, beyond a minimum threshold
 - What is the purpose for evaluating and reporting on the CNP?
 - How can we ensure that enough flexibility and accountability is built into the evaluation process (e.g., allow states to determine goals and priorities)?
 - What is the purpose for evaluating and reporting on the CNP?
 - Identify purpose/goals of evaluation and intended audience
 - Can evaluation be process prioritized (e.g., management measures are to be implemented everywhere) (can we prioritize by key issues, impairments?)?
 - What is the timing and when does it start?
 - How will the reports be used by feds or states?
 - Defining purpose of evaluation and reporting – Progress? Education? Dollar support? Audience? Improvements?
 - Format and content of reporting requirements
 - Need to determine what needs to be reported? Qualitative versus quantitative
 - What do we report on? Programmatic? Environmental?
 - What needs to be included in a report: Success stories, data on water quality?

- NPS results hard to measure/demonstrate in short time period – bean counts, performance indicators, environmental improvements
 - Content and frequency of reports
 - Need to incorporate programmatic (policy/legislative changes, etc.) and not just BMP implementation
 - States and territories should have a menu of options to report information. (Not a “one size fits all” reporting and evaluation standard)
 - Reporting requirement unclear – based on what? 5/15-year plans, measured outcomes, criteria, format
 - What should reports contain? (Meet federal and state needs)
 - What type of information/evaluation will be most effective to persuade OMB and Congress to continue to increase 6217 funding?
- Role of EPA/NOAA in evaluation and reporting
 - CNP should be evaluated by NOAA only
 - Will NOAA and EPA evaluate the program jointly?
 - Need to identify/know role(s) of EPA and NOAA in reporting
 - State want feedback from NOAA/EPA – Do they measure up? What happens if they don’t measure up? Do they need additional management measures?
 - Policy and legislation
 - Need for national evaluation of program and pursue legislative changes

The following new issues (thought not to be included in the white paper) were identified:

- States want feedback from NOAA/EPA – Do states measure up? What happens if we don’t? Need to develop additional management measures?
 - Develop minimum standards (e.g., increase in number of BMPs, percentage of coastal zone coverage) for evaluation that assures level or increased funding
 - Will EPA/NOAA do their share on interstate issues? Atmospheric deposition, interstate transport, pollution prevention/product bans
 - Need to evaluate 6217 program nationally and pursue legislative changes to improve
-

Coordination

Participants, working in table groups, identified no more than five issues they felt if addressed would move the coordination forward. They also were given an opportunity to identify additional issues they thought of importance but that were not included in the paper. The five issues could come from the paper or be ones not included in the paper. Each table's issues were brought forth, sorted into like groupings, and given a group name. The results (group title and information from sticky notes used in the sorting process) were as follows:

- Federal coordination
 - EPA should include 6217 in its annual water quality initiatives and budget requests
 - Coordination is needed between EPA's various programs
 - Can the states be given opportunity to evaluate NOAA/EPA's coordination?
 - Federal to federal coordination is lacking – EPA/NOAA/NRCS, USDA, etc. re: expectations for CZARA, in reviewing and supporting each state
 - Increased consistency among regions regarding support/review of 6217 program development/implementation
 - Federal partners lead by example; coordinate at federal level – federal partners (USDA, NRCS, DOT), NOAA-EPA, EPA headquarters – EPA regions – to implement management measures and for program evaluation and approvals
 - National water quality/CZ conference/workshops rarely include 6217 staff and issues
 - Need consistency between EPA regions and EPA headquarters
 - Consistency reviews provided in 319 and CZMA programs are not fully taken advantage of
 - How do we coordinate federal assistance to states?
 - Federal agency coordination with other federal agencies (DOT, USDA – cooperative extension)
 - How can you improve the communication/coordination – intra-fed, fed-fed, fed-state, state-fed, intra-state – NOAA, EPA, EPQ headquarters?
 - Need for NOAA/EPA to facilitate NRCS funding toward coastal zone
 - Need coordination at/between different government levels – fed (EPA/NOAA), state (agencies, states, local), fed/state – clear goals, clear process
 - Need for dedicated federal staff to continuously coordinate with other federal agencies on water quality programs
 - For new NPS programs coming online, need to coordinate with federal level to ensure they integrate 6217 program/CNP
 - Federal agencies develop process for coordinating new programs with existing ones and providing guidance on same to states

- Overall coordination issues
 - Overlapping jurisdictions on enforcement permits, standards
 - What are the benefits that encourage others to cooperate and coordinate?
 - Federal agencies – NOAA/EPA/USDA, state – CZM, NPS, NRCS-CD's – vertical and horizontal coordination at federal and state levels
 - Clearly articulate goals and responsibilities of all NPS programs at state and federal levels
 - “Sharing” mechanism that encourages asking questions, “lessons learned” – not just success stories
 - How can we overcome resistance to integrate state programs – Phase II people versus 319 versus NRCS versus CNP versus CZM? What value does CNP add? Does the push need to come from feds? What's the carrot?
 - How to coordinate/involve other stakeholder groups that impact NPS but have not traditionally participated? Example: DOT, local town engineers
 - Effective coordination depends on level of implementation flexibility
 - How to build effective partnerships amongst reluctant federal, state, and local entities?
 - Explore watershed management as coordinating mechanism for 6217 programs and other NPS programs
 - To what extent can other agencies participate in 5-year plan development?
 - Create national regional and state working groups

- State coordination
 - How to effectively bring in local government into process?
 - Need to integrate all the mandates required of state, examples: TMDL implementation, 319, 6217, Estuary, etc.
 - Lack of a formal internal state coordination mechanism
 - Local government coordination success stories and discussion of obstacles to collaborating with them
 - How do we encourage other state programs to participate in coastal NPS program (what's the motivation?)?
 - Not using limited resources efficiently – TMDL, 319, CNPs
 - Define purpose of coordination – efficient use of state resources
 - State-level coordination of 6217 with CZM, 319 and TMDL programs (include incentives)
 - Lack of lead agency authority over implementation of management measures
 - Improved coordination between state coastal program and state water quality program region EPA
 - Need mechanism to overcome state level problems with coastal programs not having authority if implementation program is in another agency/municipality, etc.

- State agencies need to coordinate with other state agencies (DOT, Agriculture) (leverages dollars and projects)
- Miscellaneous coordination issues
 - Need mechanism for common goal setting and accountability to force coordination. Common goals need to focus on issues, gaps, etc. (example: septic)
 - Need accountability from NOAA/EPA in providing information in a timely fashion
 - Provide dedicated person for contact (include site visits) to states
 - How to respond and adapt to new programs, and continue effective coordination
 - Re-evaluate national program to facilitate effective coordination (i.e., do cost/benefit analysis on having one lead federal agency)
 - Provide all information in writing
 - Lack of synergism on collaborative efforts to solve difficult problems, i.e., mechanism in place, but people not exchanging ideas/solutions

The following new issue (thought not to be included in the white paper) was identified:

- How will budget crises affect coordination within states? – Maybe increase the need to coordinate and use resources more efficiently
-

Tracking and Monitoring

Participants, working in table groups, identified no more than five issues they felt if addressed would move the tracking and monitoring forward. They also were given an opportunity to identify additional issues they thought of importance but that were not included in the paper. The five issues could come from the paper or be ones not included in the paper. Each table's issues were brought forth, sorted into like groupings, and given a group name. The results (group title and information from sticky notes used in the sorting process) were as follows:

- Flexibility and targeting
 - Should CNP target data on the 14 digital stream reach code – tie into 319 reporting requirements?
 - Target monitoring efforts geographically by impaired waters, or by management measures
 - Prioritize management measures or geographic for tracking
 - Is it necessary to track and monitor across the 6217 areas all 56 management measures or is a targeted approach acceptable?
 - Targeting: Can CNPs focus on a subset of management measures or geographic areas?
 - Will there be minimum thresholds for monitoring?
 - What does Congress/public need/want to know to justify 6217?
 - Minimum level of type of reporting on management measures should be standardized among states as recommended by states to NOAA/EPA
 - How to track day-to-day activities that translate to management measures?
 - Flexibility
 - Each state should have flexibility to decide what the priority for monitoring and tracking is and the scale
 - Need for assistance from EPA and NOAA on what is expected while allowing for state flexibility
- Water quality versus management measures
 - How to track or better coordinate BMPs that are implemented by other agencies and on what scale?
 - Monitoring effectiveness or trends in water quality improvement?
 - Will we have to demonstrate water quality improvements?
 - The program will show a correlation between water quality and management measures implementation by 2010 – each state will show correlation by the end of their 15-year program
 - Should try to link monitoring and tracking efforts to water quality data to greatest extent possible?

- What you track needs to be useful for own program evaluation but also in evaluation overall water quality goals
 - The program should track the implementation of management measures and use existing water quality programs to report on water quality changes
 - States need to define what management measures to track in 5-15-year plan
 - Define the purpose of tracking/monitoring – is it to track the implementation of management measures to assess implementation of the program? Is it to track and monitor the effectiveness of the management measures for improvement of water quality?
 - The pollutant reduction effectiveness of guidance BMPs has been demonstrated. 6217 should focus on tracking BMP proliferation and leave load reduction and stream monitoring to the clean water act.
- Coordination – tracking and monitoring
 - Must work with other agencies responsive for tracking NPS to ensure data sharing
 - Must be consistent – input from other agencies – data base system development and management is key!
 - Can 6217 rely on tracking performed by other programs (319, Farm Bill)?
 - Data and information from other agencies/organizations – coordination
 - What existing information is available? How about NRCS, agriculture BMP information? What about other partners?
 - What should be the local role in tracking and monitoring?
 - What are the existing methods available to track 6217 management measures? New monitoring and tracking programs should build upon existing programs and fill in the gaps
 - What is the best mechanism for tracking and monitoring?
 - Should the section 319 and 6217 program reporting and tracking satisfy TMDL programs? Does TMDLs drive?
 - Purpose of tracking and monitoring
 - Define purpose – consistent with state priorities, what story to tell, tie to 5/15-year plans
 - What is the purpose of tracking and monitoring?
 - Link monitoring to program goals, definition of implementation and definition of success
 - What are we tracking and why?
 - What is the purpose of tracking and monitoring?
 - Role of this program should be to promote coordination of existing monitoring efforts (303d, etc.)

- How is 6217 monitoring and tracking unique or different from other efforts, i.e., TMDL, etc.?
- Important to track 6217 influence on other NPS and water resource programs
- Resources issues
 - Need dollars to monitor
 - How to provide effective tracking and monitoring with limited resources?
 - Consistent with funding (realism) – actual water quality monitoring is dollars
 - Determine the appropriate scale and level of monitoring and tracking given limited resources in terms of FTEs and technical expertise
 - What support is available to help states design a state-specific management measures tracking system – financial and technical?
 - Tracking and monitoring mechanisms should be cost-effective and “do-able” for the state given its resources
- Reporting - tracking and monitoring
 - Develop national guidelines for minimum reporting on state-initiated or funded projects to enable a national database on BMP use
 - What basic information do NOAA/EPA need and in what format?
 - Could a standardize GIS tracking/reporting system be developed and provided by NOAA?
 - Monitoring and tracking need to reflect on what states are being evaluated on
 - How will data be used by state and feds, and what is the purpose beyond?
 - How will tracking information be utilized?
- Miscellaneous issues
 - When does tracking and monitoring begin – Conditional approval, full approval?
 - Limited ability to follow up on compliance with conservation plans, permit conditions, outreach programs

Additional Questions/Comments

(Collected from index cards left on tables following small group work session)

The following questions/comments were on the index cards left on the tables following small group work that did not make it into the small group reports:

- What degree of freedom do states have in choosing what to target for implementation?
- Timing of programmatic implementation
- In Virginia – critical role of local governments – how to achieve success without control over land use
- Conditional approval expiration
- Expectations have gotten out of control – need for focus and prioritization
- Feds should be about finding stable and adequate funding
- How can NOAA and EPA allow states to self-define goals while ensuring a base level of consistency/compliance
- Effective implementation is dependent upon effective participation (presence) in contributing programs, for which staffing is inadequate.
- Comprehensive accounting for participatory programs is impracticable.
- Targets must account for counter effects of growth.
- Mechanisms – CNP is a piece of a comprehensive, state NPS management program – not an independent entity, which is too inefficient and duplicative.
- Need to consider BMP efficiency and cost and growth – underplays the importance of pollution prevention
- So much is going on in watersheds that it is hard to keep track and coordinate
- The number of other programs that the 6217 coordinator has to coordinate with is overwhelming.
- Education
- A website listing what each state is doing annually.
- Lack of identify – so many NPS programs
- Targeting something other than SWCD projects for 6217 – need help with ideas
- What are the benefits of having program recognition for 6217 (small-networked – competing programs)
- If each state implementation means different things then what is the national picture/message?
- Can we prioritize management measures by impact for watersheds?
- How do you measure the effectiveness of 6217 in context of other programs?
- Water quality trading – does it exclude implementation?
- Cultural changes and personal stewardship – responsibility must be cultivated in US – communicate advantages for
- If there has been a TMDL load allocation process completed for a watershed, and entities responsible for each land use must demonstrate compliance with their load allocation what can 6217 contribute to the monitoring effort?
- What support is available to help states design a state-specific tracking system?

- CNP monitoring should be folded into a comprehensive water quality assessment approach to avoid redundancy, e.g., 305(b), 303(d).
 - Programmatic tracking is more practical but is a drain on resources that might better be directed towards implementation or partnership building.
-
-

Setting Priorities Among the Issue groupings

The participants used the following criteria to determine which of the above issue groupings (for the four white paper topics) they would work with for the remainder of the session to develop plans/solutions:

- We can make a decision within 24 hours and get group commitment
- It is an area that NOAA/EPA/the states can do “something” to help the states achieve implementation
- Ways can be identified to streamline the work for states
- Something can be done now – it is a first step

Participants used colored dots to make their selections. Each person had 3 dots to use in the areas of implementation, evaluation and reporting, and tracking and monitoring and 2 dots for the area of coordination. The results were as follows:

- Implementation
 - Administrative issues – 5/15-year plans – 38 dots
 - Defining implementation – 37 dots
 - Need for coordination and integration – 32 dots
 - Need for clarifying expectations – 6 dots
 - Need for marketing and more visibility – 6 dots
 - Flexibility/consistency in defining implementation – state focus – 3 dots
 - Increase funding – stable funding base – 1 dot
- Evaluation and reporting
 - Need for integrating the reporting processes – 44 dots
 - Need for minimum standards/criteria – 34 dots
 - Format and content of reporting requirements – 26 dots
 - Need to clarify the purpose of evaluation and reporting and identify the intended audience – 7 dots
 - Role of EPA/NOAA in evaluation and reporting – 3 dots
 - Policy and legislation – 0 dots
- Coordination
 - Federal coordination – 29 dots
 - State coordination – 26 dots
 - Overall coordination issues – 2 dots
 - Miscellaneous coordination issues – 2 dots
- Tracking and monitoring
 - Flexibility and targeting - 36 dots

- Water quality versus management measures – 35 dots
 - Purpose of tracking and monitoring – 33 dots
 - Coordination of tracking and monitoring – 7 dots
 - Resource issues – 0 dots
 - Reporting issues – 0 dots
-
-

Issue Resolution
***** Work groups' Reports*****

Each participant self-selected the issue with which she/he would like to work to develop plans/solutions. Plans were developed and reports given. Persons not a part of the work group were encouraged to write ideas to strengthen the plans on a sticky note and attach it to the report. The reports for each of the selected issues and the ideas to strengthen the plans follow.

Defining Implementation

- Defining implementation
 - Target priorities
 - Realistic progress
- Defining implementation
 - Recognize CZARA primary goal
 - States target priorities based on approved plan to meet goal
 - States show reasonable progress in implementing that reflect priorities
 - Full implementation is a moving target – change and develop as time goes by
 - Implementation is iterative and integrated – monitor, track, report other programs' coordination
- Target priorities
 - Priority watersheds
 - NPS category
 - Impairments
 - Areas to be protected (e.g., CCAs)
 - Areas to be restored (not water quality)
 - Program (e.g., source water/wellhead protection, wetlands program)
 - Individual management measure
 - Possible mechanisms to identify target priorities include 303 (d) list habitat restoration plans communicated via 5/15-year plans/for example
- Reasonable progress
 - Feasible and achievable with respect to state resources
 - Will vary from state to state depending on targeted priorities
 - States recognize need to assess efforts and make mid-course adjustments

Integration of Reporting Processes

- Issue: Multiple/duplicative reporting and evaluations for different purposes
- Goal/outcome: Develop several (options) model approaches for reporting/evaluation
- Recommendations/next steps
 - Reporting (state function)
 1. Inventory existing federal reports/evaluations: Matrix? E.g., 319 and grants; 306, 309, 312 and grants; 305 (b) Determine frequency, requirements, purpose, content, audience
 2. Develop amalgamation of common elements – determine overlaps
 3. Identify requirements/needs unique to NOAA/EPA
 4. Identify state needs (e.g., increase intrastate coordination, identify gaps, etc.) from reporting
 5. Develop options using existing reporting mechanisms: streamline and meet state needs (e.g., revisit 5/15-year plans, 319 annual report, etc.)
 - Evaluation (federal function)
 1. Inventory existing federal evaluation process/guidance
 2. Identify common elements
 3. Identify unique elements – NOAA/EPA
 4. Identify state needs
 5. Link reporting and evaluations in streamlined process

Comments on sticky notes attached to the work group report

- Agree – state needs for reporting implementation must be taken in consideration. Helps with coordinating intrastate programs and efforts
- Reporting should not be any more than the 5/15-year plan requirements which might should be amended to address the issues discussed in Richmond

Minimum Standards/Criteria

- Minimum standards/criteria
 - Use key elements concepts for guiding principals (example: 319)
 - Each state/territory develops a reporting and planning strategy with federal/state partners that capitalizes on existing reporting mechanisms (example: 309/312) and other agencies
 - 5/15-year plan – evaluate to determine utility given other reporting mechanisms
 - Evaluation based on the ability to address key elements above

- Continued communication and evaluation of program effectiveness with federal partners
- Outcome indicators: NOAA and EPA requirements
- Issue: Effective state/territory evaluation
- Goal: To develop a consistent minimum set of criteria to evaluate the 6217 program
- Next Steps:
 - Develop “key elements” that measure the states’ effectiveness and efficiency in achieving the program objectives
 - Reporting: Develop reporting options
 - Develop a state-specific reporting strategy on 6 major reporting strategy on 6 major program areas
 - Identify outcome indicators: NOAA and EPA

State Coordination and Coordination and Integration (merged two issues together)

Model Coordination Improvement Strategy - intrastate

I. Baseline status

1. Identify highest level and strength of support and commitment for 6217
2. Identify/evaluate existing coordinating relationship
 - a. Compile list of existing coordinating bodies: state councils, great lakes commission, interstate organizations, legislators, NPS advisory

II. Structure design

1. Identify an ideal coordinating structure
2. Identify areas where coordinating relationships should be changed/strengthened
 - a. Raise awareness among watershed groups re: 6217 – planning support (watershed groups become advocates of 6217 as coordinating program)
3. Prioritize needed changes/strengthen coordinating relationships
 - a. Prioritize/focus the absolute necessities of coordination to have an effective program

III. Feasibility

1. Characterize willingness of both/all parties to change/strengthen relationships
2. Identify sources of support, assistance and leverage to change/strengthen priority relationships
 - a. USEPA reference 6217 management measures within 319 Guidance on watershed planning
 - b. Analyze effectiveness of existing MOUs – identify models
 - c. Annual request from state to EPA/NOAA for assistance for intrastate coordinating needs
3. Identify ways to encourage needed/wanted coordination – dollars
 - a. Raise respect/credibility of 6217
 - b. Develop persuasive characterization of 6217 strengths – talking points
 - c. Raise the awareness among watershed groups re: 6217 – planning support – watershed groups become advocates

IV. Implement

1. Implement coordination program that fits near-term goals
 - a. States estimate/identify coordination process (strategy): meetings, LISTSERVs, newsletter

Other ideas:

- Define issues/programs for 6217 as primary coordinator (clean marinas, ...)
- States characterize relationships (flowcharts, matrices, ...) and identify where improvements should/can be made
- Analyze effectiveness of existing MOUs – identify models
- Assess/evaluate/identify highest level of knowledge and commitment within government for 6217

Comment on sticky note attached to the work group report

- Suggestion: Establish a NPS Advisory Committee comprised of all NPS agencies/organizations

Federal Coordination

Goal: Recommend actions that states, NOAA, and USEPA can implement to improve coordination with:

- Other state water resource programs
- Other federal water resource programs
- Programs that have impact on water resources

6217 coordination

- Need adequate turnaround time. Actions – EPA/NOAA must respond to state submittals within 45 days. If EPA/NOAA cannot respond within that 45-day period then they must send an interim letter requesting an additional 15 days. (A total of 45 days.) (This was supposed to be implemented since Landsdowne.)
- Should have a database available that indicates CZARA approvals, actions, outstanding conditions, etc. (Collaboration purposes)
- If a number of states have the same outstanding condition keeping them from full approval and money, EPA and NOAA should revisit the condition to see how they can adjust their expectation for those state without forcing the state to submit horse dung to get approval!
- EPA regional people should also help find ways to address outstanding issues
- Federal register notice – 6217 rules, must speak with one voice, must be official internal procedures and guidance that EPA/NOAA must adhere to
- Federal agency coordination
 - USDA state technical committees – NRCS liaison, cooperative extension liaison
 - USFWS – marinas – fish passages/HYDROMOD
 - US Army Corps – HYDROMOD
 - DOT – TEA21/roads bridges and highways
- At federal level include 6217 into conferences/workshops that address other programs, i.e., water quality in general
- State consistency provision – John Kuriawa and Dov Weitman will discuss consistency requirements with CZMA and 319
- Coordination of other monies/technical assistance, new program initiatives (credit trading?). States must receive information regarding stuff that may impact 6217. (Maybe have a 6217 ombudsman.) States should be able to request assistance [maybe have a coordination clearinghouse (WEB)].

Comments on sticky notes attached to the work group report

- Need mechanism to bring NOAA and EPA together to provide unified guidance and feedback to states on program approvals, 5/15-year strategy development, approval of tracking mechanisms, etc. This will entail interagency communication at the headquarters level and consistent guidance to the regions. Need to specify time frame and approach.
- Please gear the actions toward full approval of all states so next workshop(s) can be under a more united front/good goals!

- Please include an outline of steps to formally establish the “60 day rule.” This is to be put in law, put in the Federal Register and institutionalized
- “Assumed concurrence” will not pass legal review muster with feds. Added comment: and so, what’s your point?

Purpose of Tracking and Monitoring

- Purpose of tracking and monitoring:
 - Tracking
 - Assess progress toward achieving overall goal of program (implement all management measures within 15-year timeframe)
 - Track actions of program as outlined by 5/15-year plan to document program progress and success
 - Monitoring
 - To evaluate/assess water quality improvements
 - To evaluate the effectiveness of individual BMPs/management measures
- Recommendations
 - Incorporate refined definition of “the purpose of tracking and monitoring” into white paper
 - Track and monitor to get information to help improve program effectiveness as appropriate for each state
 - Make use of existing programs and data

Comments on sticky notes attached to the work group report

- Monitoring by other water quality programs
- Why examine the effectiveness of individual management measures – are they to prove effectiveness? Is there not water quality monitoring?
- The purposes identified are true but are they what CZARA envisioned for tracking and monitoring? If these “definitions” get incorporated into white papers, then the states will buy into these as appropriate. What’s the CZARA basis and need for tracking and monitoring?

Flexibility and Targeting

- Track throughout 6217 management area (entire):
 - Watershed protection management measures

- Pollutant prevention management measures
- Monitoring
- The above is a working list
- For all other management measures and administrative activities, states can have flexibility to target geographically and by management measure (states already have this authority – administrative changes) – see monitoring and tracking paper, pages 6 and 7

Clarification needed: “prioritize” versus “target”

- “Prioritize” – do all management measures everywhere eventually
- “Target” – address only the most critical, i.e., correct real world problems

Action steps:

1. Track throughout 6217 management area (entire)
 - a. Consult with NOAA to determine what management measures should be monitored/tracked across the states satisfy need for accountability with OMB and Congress – MERs
 - b. Post list of management measures to be widely tracked to the entire NPS listserv for comment
 - c. Work group write up results for agreement
2. Ensure that all states develop and submit the 5/15-year strategy
3. Level of monitoring/tracking for monitoring/tracking – work group will survey states to determine:
 - a. What management measures are being tracked now?
 - b. At what level of detail?

Comments on sticky notes attached to the work group report

- Survey the desired level of detail for tracking and monitoring
- I disagree that the watershed protection measure should be required to be tracked/monitored for all states. Urban might not be a priority for all states; Retrofits/schedules for pollution reduction loads are likely to be a huge undertaking.
- I disagree with #1 because some of the required management measures may not be appropriate/feasible to all states. Possibly let states set priority management measures and have those set as the “required” management measures.

Water Quality versus Management Measures

- First, need to determine purpose and whether there’s flexibility

- Purpose – show progress and results
- Assume some flexibility
- Need quantifiable measures – how to define?
- State water quality programs must look at monitoring and improvements to water
- Track implementation of large measures with 303(d) listed waters
- RI: management measures put into permit requirements, so implementation tracked that way, e.g., Nexus with TMDLs – NPS actions
- To implement TMDLs and remove waters from 303 (d) list, management measures are needed
- Do tracking of management measures where other people are monitoring water quality
- Feds should encourage (fund) monitoring but not through CNP. Build existing efforts
- If 6217 dollars used for monitoring, allow flexibility on how it is spent:
 - What type of management measures will be monitored? (state coordination)
 - State watershed management agency?
 - Monitoring management measures implemented at local level is challenge – pilot project for locals in MA, e.g., septic in MA
- Iterative planning process – state defines priorities with feds – come to agreement – monitors and track only what CNP implementation funds spent on
 - Track local measures
 - How to help states meet monitoring and tracking goals?
- Policy statement – CNP monitoring/tracking should focus on management measures implementation. Water quality improvements should be tracked by other water quality based programs
- When making decisions on which management measures or which areas to track, states should take into account other existing efforts, e.g., TMDLs, NERR, NEP, that do water quality monitoring
- Programmatic tracking easier than numbers of management measures/BMPs
- States should be encouraged, where necessary, to use federal funds to track/monitor locally implemented management measures, i.e., include monitoring/tracking conditions in local contracts
- Selection of management measures to be tracked: States should have flexibility/their own process. TMDLs are obstacle and potential opportunity
- Are NOAA/EPA okay with state-defined monitoring/tracking plans?
- Will feds require some level of standardization? How is it reported?
- Action steps:
 - Compile recommendations
 - Integrate results to white papers
 - Review and revise white papers

- Finalize white papers
- NOAA/EPA review results and implement through new policy guidance or revised guidance
- States will revisit (if necessary) monitoring and tracking through 5/15-year plan and annual grants

Comments on sticky notes attached to the work group report

- Implementation needs to be defined for this topic. Just because a program has been started or a regulation has been passed doesn't mean it is being enforced
 - Does this cover monitoring of administrative requirements? (policy statement)
 - Are "we" going to base progress on water quality assessment or not?
-
-

Closing Discussion

In bringing closure to the workshop, participants were asked to either identify next steps or share other pertinent comments. The comments are as follows:

- Concerned didn't get to hear from all the states regarding examples of how things are working in their states.
- Concerned there weren't PowerPoint presentations relative to examples for each of the topics in the four white papers. John Kuriawa indicated he would be glad to hear from states on what would be a meaningful way of presenting success stories. Dov Weitman reported that on the 319 side, the success stories are fairly current on their website. It was suggested that participants go to other states' websites for success stories as well.
- Ken Smith reported he would like to see inexpensive solutions. Greg DuCote stated that the LA state CNP website has links to all of the other 6217 and 319 websites from their front page.
- Several participants voiced concern about improving federal review time of materials submitted by the states. It was also suggested that without a reasonable turn around time for reviewing materials, states should 'presume federal concurrence'.
- Re-circulate the white papers after they have been revised. Consider adding the names on the "green (sign-up) sheets" to the current work groups. John Kuriawa indicated he would send e-mail in a couple of weeks asking for volunteers to serve on a committee.
- Use the listserv to form small groups and hold discussions relative to the issues.
- John Kuriawa committed that he on behalf of the federal partners would give a monthly update of progress as a follow-up to the meeting.
- Issue of a "next" meeting as a follow-up to this one: It was suggested that another meeting was needed. EPA stated they would try to identify available funding. Jack Gregg invited everyone to California – if possible.
- There is a need to develop a model approach for evaluation and reporting. It was suggested "something" needs to be ready by September.
- There is a need for EPA regional staff to cultivate relationships with states and not let relationships fester between states and headquarters. It was suggested that staff from the federal agencies visit with the states they work with as a means to increase the level of coordination. Some regions are more involved than others. Regions 5 and 6 were mentioned as cases in point.
- This meeting was very helpful in seeing NOAA and EPA contacts face to face.
- It was suggested that the requirements in 5/15-year plans be altered to address the issues that were addressed at this meeting. Gloria Putnam agreed to lead the charge on this effort.
- It was suggested that useful solutions be developed in response to the issues raised during the meeting. It was stated that it is important the solutions be ones that would work for most states. This listing should be made available as soon as possible.
- Need to move the approval process forward.

- Leave stream water quality requirements to CWA, not as part of 6217.
- Incorporate reporting mechanisms into existing reporting mechanisms. Amanda Punton volunteered to take charge of a quick turnaround on important first steps.
- Susan Miller stated she would be willing to assist in editing and volunteered to do editing on the results of this meeting/the white papers.
- In the long-term, funding is critical even though it was not an issue addressed during this meeting.
- Need to move the focus from approval and not-approved states to improved states in order to remove the dichotomy between approved and non-approved states.
- The list of state needs that was developed at Landsdowne needs to be looked at again. What are the areas of technical expertise among various folks in the states? States that have full approval could serve as technical experts on what needs to be done to reach full approval.
- The National Estuaries Program can be used as a resource for lessons learned and a technology transfer process. There are 28 programs across the country.
- Even though the white papers did a good job of flushing out the issues, we need to have some guidance for consistency across states from the federal government. The program has been in place three years and states are implementing without knowing what that means and they are monitoring and tracking without really knowing what that means.
- Performance indicators need to be included in future evaluations
- We need time frames for work once there is a final report
- Need to establish benchmarks for the next 6 months. How will they be established? What are the timeframes? The benchmarks and timeframes should be included in the final report.
- It would be helpful to have a matrix listing states and where they are on the approval process. It would allow for technology transfer in areas where a state may be lacking, etc.
- Can EPA-headquarters and regions improve their coordination to assist the states to get to approval more effectively?
- Next year, it might be effective to have EPA regional meetings and island meetings as well as the larger meeting. They could be held prior to the larger gathering.
- If EPA and NOAA cannot tell states what it is they want, they can never seek the appropriate funding because they will not know what it costs.
- Dov Weitman suggested including the states with NOAA and EPA to figure out the next steps. These partnerships could resolve policy issues and review technical documents.
- Only a few Section 319 program people were present, they need to be more involved.
- Identify key subject areas and have people volunteer to head up areas.
- Need to get the 319 work groups more involved as well in the 6217 groups.

Overall Meeting Comments

A summary of the comments provided on index cards at the end of the meeting is as follows:

What went well/was liked

- The meeting was very productive; let's not let ideas fall through.
- The table transfers were helpful in communicating with other states and regions.
- It was very well organized and focused; the facilitator was excellent.
- Overall good meeting but (other comments below)
- The food was great as was the hotel.
- I liked the amount of time we had to discuss each topic. It didn't feel rushed and allowed everyone to share their opinions.
- Thanks to Mark for all his hard work and the time and energy the workgroups dedicated to the papers. Great job!

What did not like/wish had been done differently

- It was very intense and I got pretty burned out towards day's end – I'd recommend a two-hour lunch of some sort of break to another topic or activity to break the intense focus up a bit.
- I personally feel that we overanalyzed several topics already effectively by the papers, but that has naught to do with the workshop structure.
- More effort put into clarifying process AHEAD of actually starting
- Separate meetings (within large meeting) to address the individual issues (i.e., I think one for implementation and one for approval steps would have been good)
- The group was frustrated at the pace of the meeting. It moved too slowly and the facilitator would not abandon her pre-set formula to accommodate the group.
- The facilitator also allowed the group too much discretion over defining the process (i.e., why did we need to discuss the dot criteria for 30 minutes? She could have provided guidance to the group in 3 minutes and just done it. The criteria was simply commonsense)
- Meeting should have been two days. A better pace and less process discussion would have allowed us to wrap up in two days.

Ideas for another workshop

- All 6217 national meetings should include a “networking” session for new folks